



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,044	04/09/2004	Ronald R. Erickson	2003-02PAT	2270

7590 03/24/2005

Sills, Cummis Radin, Tischman,
Epstein & Gross, P.A.
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, NJ 07102

EXAMINER

BOUTSIKARIS, LEONIDAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2872

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. <u>10/822,044</u>	Applicant(s) ERICKSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Leo Boutsikaris	Art Unit 2872	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It does not identify the mailing address of each inventor. A mailing address is an address at which an inventor customarily receives his or her mail and may be either a home or business address. The mailing address should include the ZIP Code designation. The mailing address may be provided in an application data sheet or a supplemental oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.63(c) and 37 CFR 1.76.

It is noted that the new declaration, submitted on 12/13/2004, still does not indicate the post office address of the inventors. If the post office address of the inventors is the same as the residence address, it should be indicated as "same".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Daniel (US 6,280,891).

Art Unit: 2872

Regarding claim 1, Daniel discloses a device for limiting the reproducibility of information in the form of a security hologram affixed to a document (Figs. 1, 3) comprising a semi-rigid carrier 1; and a holographic element 4 coupled to the carrier (Figs. 2, 4), the holographic element being such, that upon viewing, it provides a first set of optical information in the form of a first coded pattern (e.g., a bar code) 16, see Fig. 6, and a second set of optical information in the form of a second coded pattern (e.g., a bar code) 17, see Fig. 7, depending on the illumination angle (lines 53-58, col. 4, 21-48, col. 5, 12-43, col. 6).

Regarding claims 2-3, the patterns 16, 17 are used for authentication, coded according to a secret coding function/algorithm, which may be the same or different depending on the document (lines 24-32, col. 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniel (US 6,280,891) in view of Jung (US 4,171,864).

Regarding claim 4, Daniel discloses all the limitations of the above claim including a reader system, which includes a light source 17, a first and a second detector positioned at respective predetermined distances from the location of the holographic element (provided on the surface of carrier 3), the detectors being provided on CCD sensor 18 (Fig. 8, lines 44-56, col. 6).

Art Unit: 2872

Each detector corresponds to a respective angle of incidence for the reading light. However, Daniel does not specify that the reader system comprises a reader housing having an opening where the holographic element/carrier is positioned. Jung discloses an identification security document and a display system for reading it (Fig. 5), wherein the security hologram 10 is positioned inside an appropriate reader apparatus 17 through an opening (see Fig. 5, and lines 25-46, col. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to read the security document 3 of Daniel via a reader device as taught by Jung, for achieving a robust reader device ensuring the same optical alignment each time the document is read.

Regarding claim 5, the reader apparatus utilizes a microcomputer (lines 52-56, col. 6 in Daniel).

Regarding claim 6, the first and second detectors comprise arrays of detectors in the form of a CCD array 18 (lines 52-54, col. 6).

Response to Applicant's Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 12/13/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the device of Daniel comprises a multi-layer structure as opposed to the claimed device which includes a holographic element having at least one holographic layer, the at least one holographic layer including a first and a second set of optical information in the form of a coded pattern. Even though the Examiner does not disagree that the device of Daniel is a multi-layer device, it must be noted that the device of Fig. 2 or Fig. 4 includes a

Art Unit: 2872

single holographic layer 4, which includes (i.e., creates) two separate sets of optical information in the form of two bar code images 16 and 17, respectively (see Figs. 6-7). The fact that the device of Daniel may include additional layers such as a printed bar code is irrelevant to whether the device of Daniel includes all the positive limitations of claim 1.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Leo Boutsikaris whose telephone number is 571-272-2308.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 2872

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Leo Boutsikaris, Ph.D.
Primary Patent Examiner, AU 2872
March 18, 2005 

LEONIDAS BOUTSIKARIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER